

Message

From: Calvino, Maria Soledad [Calvino.Maria@epa.gov]
Sent: 9/26/2018 8:56:20 PM
To: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]; Fairbanks, Brianna [Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov]; Yogi, David [Yogi.David@epa.gov]; Lane, Jackie [Lane.Jackie@epa.gov]; Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]
CC: Zito, Kelly [ZITO.KELLY@EPA.GOV]; Glenn, William [Glenn.William@epa.gov]
Subject: SF Chronicle inquiry to Navy FW: questions from SF Chronicle about Tetra Tech, Navy, and Building 606
Attachments: SF Chronicle questions to Navy 9-25-18.docx; pads.png; 2007-08-06 From Ralph Pearce.pdf

Hi team,

FYI – The Navy got a very similar request from SF Chronicle reporters, Jason and Cynthia. (The Navy's inquiry cites specific correspondence between one of the City's Industrial Hygienists and the Navy –attached). They are still evaluating how/when to respond. They will share their response once developed. I let the group know we are in a similar position and will share with them our responses/strategy once I have more information.

Thank you,

Soledad Calvino
Press Officer | Office of Public Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Region 9
calvino.maria@epa.gov
Office 415.972.3512 | Mobile 415.697.6289

-----Original Message-----

From: Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [mailto:william.d.franklin@navy.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2018 1:35 PM
To: Kagan, Rachael (DPH) <rachael.kagan@sfdph.org>; juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov; jeff.cretan@sfgov.org; McKinney, Kasheica (CII) (kasheica.mckinney@sfgov.org) <kasheica.mckinney@sfgov.org>; Calvino, Maria Soledad <Calvino.Maria@epa.gov>
Cc: Dale.Schornack@cdph.ca.gov
Subject: FW: questions from SF Chronicle about Tetra Tech, Navy, and Building 606

>>>Team, Jason Fagone (Chronicle) sent us the query below yesterday afternoon. We're evaluating how/when to respond. I'll share our response once developed. He's requested a response by COB Friday.

>>>Rachael, the IH that the Chronicle refers to is:

Karen Heckman MPH, CIH Senior Industrial Hygienist Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) Section San Francisco
Department of Public Health 101 Grove Street, Room 217 San Francisco, CA 94102 Phone (415)554-2762 Fax (415) 554-2562 Email Karen.Heckman@sfdph.org

R, Bill

-----Original Message-----

From: Fagone, Jason <Jason.Fagone@sfchronicle.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2018 2:49 PM
To: Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <william.d.franklin@navy.mil>
Cc: Dizikes, Cynthia <CDizikes@sfchronicle.com>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] questions from SF Chronicle about Tetra Tech, Navy, and Building 606

Hi Bill,

We are continuing our reporting of Building 606 at the shipyard.

We now understand that in 2007, Tetra Tech and the Navy began to surround Building 606 with Radiological Screening Yards and the soil pads associated with those yards. See attached image (from a 2010 Tetra Tech / Navy map in a project document). Tetra Tech was also doing radiological remediation work in close proximity to 606. In May 2007, a city industrial hygienist wrote in an email, "Building 606 will also be adjacent to some of the actual storm sewer remediation activities since the storm drains designated for removal are located on the street in front of the buildings main entrance. At some point, building 606 will be surrounded by the remediation activity on three sides of the building."

Tetra Tech's project manager, Bill Dougherty, indicated at one point that he thought the most contaminated areas of the site would be directed to the new pad yard next to 606 - known as RSY2. Other pads were later constructed at RSY3 (to the south of Building 606) and RSY4 (to the northwest).

City employees working at 606 expressed concerns about the potential health and safety implications for people at the building. And the city industrial hygienist asked explicitly in her email, "Should the Police continue to operate Building 606 during the activity? Do we believe that there is a potential for Police to be exposed to the radiological or other chemical contamination in the excavated soils?"

The city's communications from the time indicate that the city had difficulty obtaining timely information from Bill Dougherty/Tetra Tech about radiation monitoring at the soil pads next to Building 606. An industrial hygienist asked the Navy's Ralph Pearce to provide weekly results of radiation air monitoring sampling at the RSY yard next to Building 606 (RSY2). Pearce wrote in an email on 8/6/2007 that the Navy wouldn't provide this information and that instead the city would have to get it directly from Tetra Tech, from the same person who had been delaying in providing the information earlier (Bill Dougherty).

We have no records indicating that the city ever got consistent air monitoring data from either Tetra Tech or the Navy. The police continue to operate at Building 606, and there are still about 40 city employees working there today. Our questions to the Navy:

-- Why did the Navy continue to lease Building 606 in 2007 after it knew that some of the most contaminated soil in the shipyard might be taken to nearby RSY pads?

-- Why did the Navy consider it acceptable that "building 606 will be surrounded by the remediation activity on three sides of the building" while people were still working there every day?

-- In Ralph Pearce's 8/6/2007 email (attached here as as a PDF), he responds to a question from city industrial hygienist Karen Heckman. Heckman asks Pearce/Navy for reports on radiation air samples "on a weekly basis." Pearce replies, "It

will be simpler and more timely to make available current results for review. Tetrattech EC (TtEC) is the Navy's prime contractor for the sewer excavation work and RSV operation and has field offices at Hunters Point. You, or other representatives of the city, are invited to examine the results at TtEC's field office located at Hunters Point. Please contact Bill Dougherty (TtEC Construction Manager) at (415) 671-1990 to schedule an appointment time and he will make this information available." Why did Pearce and the Navy decline to provide weekly data to the city? Is it standard procedure for the Navy to refer other government agencies directly to its prime contractor to obtain air monitoring and safety data?

-- City emails from 2007 show that after the Navy declined to provide this data and referred the city to Tetra Tech and Bill Dougherty, the city had repeated difficulties actually obtaining this data from Tetra Tech. Was the Navy aware at the time that Tetra Tech was not providing this data in a timely way?

-- Was radiation air sample data gathered consistently at RSY2, RSY3, and RSY4 starting in 2007? If so, can you provide this data to us?

-- Given the scope of the data-faking allegations against Tetra Tech - allegations that have been confirmed in multiple investigations - does the Navy have confidence in the accuracy of Tetra Tech's radiation air sample data taken at the RSY pads near Building 606? Or is this data now in question?

-- If the radiation air sample data is in question, does the Navy have concerns that people working at Building 606 were put at risk because of their proximity to these pads and this radiological remediation work?

Given our deadline, we need answers to these question by the end of the day on Friday.

These same questions are also attached as a Word file, in case there are any formatting issues in this email that make the questions difficult to read.

Let us know if you have any questions and thank you for your time.

Jason Fagone and Cynthia Dizikes
Chronicle reporters